REMARKS

Reconsideration of this application, as presently amended, is respectfully requested. Claims 1-8 are pending in this application. Claims 1-8 stand rejected.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. §102

Claims 1-8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by **Hobbs** (USP 5,987,454). For the reasons set forth in detail below, this rejection, to the extent it is considered to apply to the amended claims, is respectfully traversed.

The **Hobbs** reference describes that "The push model is also known as Webcasting" (see column 4, lines 18-19). Webcasting is a function to patrol a designated site at a set time and check updated contents, and Webcasting means automatically distributing (pushing) information designated by a user from the side of a server that accumulates data. In this manner, because information is distributed upon request of the user in Webcasting, "mutual communication" is carried out.

Unlike the presently claimed invention, **Hobbs** does not disclose or suggest "a push type information interface for inputting push type information provided from a push type information distribution medium, the push type information being one-way transmitted from the push type information distribution medium." As is clear from the description on page 5, lines 1-5 of the present specification, (i.e., "The broadcast I/F 102 receives broadcast wave that is a push type information distribution medium <u>for one-way transmitting information</u> free of charge, and collects various types of information (push type information) and summaries thereof" [emphasis

added]), the push type information in accordance with the presently claimed invention is information that is distributed one-way from an information distribution medium independently of whether or not a user's request exists.

In view of the above remarks, it is respectfully submitted that the presently claimed invention patentably distinguishes over **Hobbs** for at least the above reasons.

Furthermore, it is submitted that the presently claimed invention patentably distinguishes over **Hobbs** for the additional reasons set forth below. Specifically, it is submitted that **Hobbs** does not disclose or suggest a system including "push type information and said pull type information being structured for display according to different formats" and "summaries extracted from said respective inputted push type information and the summaries of pull type information downloaded by said summary download means are structured for display according to a predetermined common format," as presently recited in claim 1.

Support for this amendment is provided, e.g., on page 6, lines 6-14 of the U.S. Application, which describes that respective downloaded information (push, pull) is described in their peculiar formats including HTML, XML and MHEG formats, while the summaries of the push type information and the pull type information are described in a predetermined common format. Moreover, note that page 1, lines 17-21 of the U.S. Application, indicates that when information is represented in different formats, such as HTML and XML, it is difficult to display search results in an integrated manner.

The operation of the **Hobbs** system will be summarized with reference to Figs. 5-10. In operation of the **Hobbs** system, first, a user, employing a browser 204, sends a request for *an*

HTML file to a document server 202. The HTML file may be an HTML document having words, phrases, sentences or paragraphs; or graphics, video and audio elements (col. 15, lines 29-43).

Fig. 6B shows the resulting view in the browser as a result of the document server's response for a user's request for a document. The document text includes a "linked term" (i.e., an embedded expert judgment).[1] The example of a linked term used in **Hobbs** is the phrase AUTOMOTIVE-RELATED INDUSTRY. See col. 17, lines 33-47. When the user clicks on the linked term, the main viewing window in the browser is divided into four frames 401, 402, 403, 404 (see Fig. 7) each frame having different functionality (col. 18, lines 6-19). Fig. 8 shows the browser windows loaded with multimedia content. It is noted that *HTML documents* corresponding to the various frames are loaded into particular named frames (see col. 18, lines 62-65). Further, Fig. 10 illustrates the display screen after the user invokes the embedded expert judgment and the database returns results (see col. 23, line 62 – col. 24, line 12).

Thus, according to **Hobbs**, the *pull-type information* is the HTML file requested by the user from the document server, and the *push-type information* is the *linked term* that is embedded in the file requested from the document server (e.g., the phrase AUTOMOTIVE-RELATED INDUSTRY). As noted above, the document requested from the document server is an HTML document, and the linked term is part of the HTML document, as shown, e.g., in Fig.

---

[1] A "linked term" is defined in **Hobbs** as an embedded expert judgment linked to words, phrases, sentences and paragraphs of text; or numbers; or maps, charts, and tables (including spread sheet; or still pictures and/or graphics; or moving pictures and/or graphics; or audio elements) contained in documents on a network resource (see, e.g., col. 1, lines 13-24). Also note, the linked terms are connected to current awareness and/or historical records from expert pre-selected data warehouses or databases (see, e.g., col. 6, lines 36-42).

6. *Therefore, both the push-type information and the pull-type information described in Hobbs are structured or described in the same format (i.e., HTML).*

Further, as discussed above, after the user clicks on the linked term, the information retrieved by clicking on the linked term and displayed in the various frames 401, 402, 403, and 404, is also *HTML data.*

In contrast, **Hobbs** does not disclose or suggest the claimed push type information interface for inputting push type information and pull type information interface for inputting pull type information and summaries of the pull type information, wherein the "push type information and said pull type information being structured for display according to different formats" and "summaries extracted from said respective inputted push type information and the summaries of pull type information downloaded by said summary download means are structured for display according to a predetermined common format," as presently recited in claim 1.

As discussed above, the pull-type information disclosed by **Hobbs** is an HTML document, and the push-type information is the linked term in the HTML document, which has the same format as the HTML document.

Further, it is submitted that **Hobbs** does not disclose or suggest the claimed *summary search means for searching summaries satisfying said search conditions from the summaries already registered in said summary storage means.* The invention recited in claim 1 extracts summaries from inputted push type information, stores the extracted summaries in a summary storage means, and searches summaries satisfying search conditions input via a search condition

input means from the summaries stored in the summary storage means. *Note, according to the claimed invention, the search conditions input via the search condition input means are also used to search summaries of the pull type information.*

In contrast to the claimed invention, even if the information obtained by clicking on the various linked terms (i.e., the push type information) is considered to be summaries (see, e.g., Fig. 8), **Hobbs** is silent with respect to storing and *then searching* these summaries using search conditions that are also used to search for and download summaries of pull type information.

For the reasons set forth above, it is submitted that independent claim 1 and claims 2-8 which depend therefrom patentability distinguish over **Hobbs** and therefore define allowable subject matter. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection under §102 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

In view of the foregoing amendments and accompanying remarks, it is submitted that all pending claims are in condition for allowance. A prompt and favorable reconsideration of the rejection and an indication of allowability of all pending claims are earnestly solicited.

If the Examiner believes that there are issues remaining to be resolved in this application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite and complete prosecution of this case.

If this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. The fees for such an extension or any other fees that may be due with respect to this paper may be charged to Deposit Account No. 50-2866.

Respectfully submitted,

WESTERMAN, HATTORI, DANIELS & ADRIAN, LLP

William M. Schertler
Attorney for Applicants
Registration No. 35,348
Telephone: (202) 822-1100
Facsimile: (202) 822-1111

WMS/dlt